



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR   | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.              | CONFIRMATION NO.       |
|---|-------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/609,260  | 06/26/2003  | Ramarathnam Venkatesan | MSI-1043US                       | 8086                   |
| 22801   | 7590        | 11/14/2007             |                                  |                        |
| LEE & HAYES PLLC<br>421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500<br>SPOKANE, WA 99201 |             |                        | EXAMINER<br>SIMITOSKI, MICHAEL J |                        |
|   |             |                        | ART UNIT<br>2134                 | PAPER NUMBER           |
|   |             |                        | MAIL DATE<br>11/14/2007          | DELIVERY MODE<br>PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                          |                        |  |                     |  |
|--------------------------|------------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| <b>Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> |  | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|                          | 10/609,260             |  | VENKATESAN ET AL.   |  |
|                          | <b>Examiner</b>        |  | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
|                          | Michael J. Simitoski   |  | 2134                |  |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Michael J. Simitoski. (3) Chris Lattin.  
 (2) Dominic Lindauer. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 31 October 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Boneh.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
**KAMBIZ ZAND**  
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant contacted the examiner to discuss the differences between the reference of record and the claims. The examiner suggested that some part of the reference, having been co-authored by one of the inventors of the instant application, might not have the implementation details set forth in the application and therefore applicant might look to those details to overcome the art. Further, the examiner suggested determining the contribution of the second inventor who was not a co-author of the reference. No particular decision or claim amendment was agreed upon.